



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MASTER AND SERVANT—INJURY FROM DANGEROUS MACHINERY—PROMISE TO REPAIR—ASSUMPTION OF RISK.—RICE v. EUREKA PAPER CO., 75 N. Y. Sup. 49.—Plaintiff worked on a defective rag-cutter. He knew the danger but was induced to remain at work by defendant's promise to repair. He was injured before the expiration of the specified time. A divided court *held*, plaintiff assumed the risk.

The assumption of risk in employment is contractual in nature. By promising to repair defective machinery does master create a new contract by which he assumes risk? The majority feeling constrained to follow N. Y. decisions decide in the negative. *McCarthy v. Washburn*, 42 App. Div. 252; *Marsh v. Chickering*, 101 N. Y. 396. The minority answer affirmatively in agreement with Cooley on Torts, 559-60, the U. S. Supreme Court, and decisions of other states. *Hough v. Ry. Co.*, 100 U. S. 213; *Ferriss v. Machine Works*, 90 Wis. 541.

NEGLIGENCE—LIABILITY OF LESSOR—McCABE'S ADMX. v. M. & B. S. R. CO., 66 S. W. 1054 (Ky.).—By authority of the legislature M. & B. S. R. R. had been leased to C. & O. R. R. Owing to negligence of lessee in operating one of its trains over the leased line intestate was killed. In suit brought by administratrix to recover damages lessor and lessee were joined as defendants. It was argued by defendants that lessee was alone responsible. *Held*, that the lessor was liable for the torts of the lessee.

The tort here was not caused by any defect in instruction, but solely by the negligence of lessee. It is not settled whether the lessor is responsible for the torts of the lessee, but the best cases seem to hold as in the main case. *R. R. v. Brown*, 17 Wall. 450; *Balsley v. R. R. Co.*, 119 Ill. 68; *Southern R. R. v. Bouknight*, 70 Fed. Rep. 442; *Nelson v. R. R.*, 26 Vt. 717. Some very carefully considered cases, however, take the opposite view. *St. L. W. & W. R. R. v. Curl*, 28 Kans. 622; *Ditchett v. R. R.*, 67 N. Y. 425; *Langley v. R. R.*, 10 Gray 103.

NEGLIGENCE—RAILROAD CARRYING MAIL.—GERMAN STATE BANK v. MINNEAPOLIS, ETC., RY. CO., 113 Fed. 414.—Plaintiff deposited in the United States mail a registered package, containing \$3000 in currency. The package was carried in a mail sack on defendant's train to its station, where through negligence of the company, it was extracted from the mail sack. *Held*, that the railroad company was not liable.

No legislation has ever arisen before on this subject. A railroad company carrying the mails does not assume as to them any of the duties or responsibilities of a common carrier. As to the mail itself the railroad has no duty except what it owes to the government, its employer.

NEGLIGENCE—STREET R. R.—REPAIRS OF STREET—ADMISSIBILITY OF MUNICIPAL RESOLUTION.—WELCH v. SYRACUSE RAPID T. CO., 75 N. Y. 173.—R. R. Law, Section 98 requires street Ry. Co. to keep in permanent repair portion of street two feet outside its tracks, under supervision of city. City Charter, Section 30 authorizes mayor and council to regulate and repair streets. Passenger on defendant's cars was injured by stepping into a hole in pavement made by a paving company working under city authority. *Held*, the resolution of city council empowering company to repave street is admissible to show whether or not defendant was negligent.